UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/711,892	10/12/2004	Anja C.S. Brau	GEMS8081.231	5891	
27061 7590 05/30/2008 ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, SC (GEMS) 136 S WISCONSIN ST PORT WASHINGTON WI 52074			EXAMINER		
			RAMIREZ, JOHN FERNANDO		
PORT WASHINGTON, WI 53074			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3737			
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			05/30/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

info@zpspatents.com rlt@zpspatents.com klb@zpspatents.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/711,892	BRAU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JOHN F. RAMIREZ	3/3/					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 13 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the control of the con	). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13	36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the si set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nortened statutory period for reply original	nally set in the final Offic	e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	filed within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	•	TE below);					
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
5. $\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	ntice of Anneal will not	· he entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
<ul><li>11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li></ul>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12.  Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13.  Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Brian L Casler/							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In relation to applicant's arguments in the response "to final action". The examiner has carefully considered all the arguments presented by applicant. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assumptions. The applicant states on page 8 of the remarks, that the Larson reference Larson does not teach, either expressly or inherently, the determination of motion in the region-of-interest directly from MR non-imaging data as set forth in claim 1. Additionally, the applicant alleges that Larson does not expressly or inherently teach the determination of motion directly from non-spatially encoded MR data. However, the examiner of record respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions. Larson discloses that the timing information may be extracted from non-imaging data (paragraphs 19 and 20), which is equivalent to non-spatially encoded data, because spatial encoding is inherently necessary in MRI in order to form the image. Therefore, Larson discloses sampling the MR signal at any time when the spatial encoding gradients are not present.